

PDF PAGE 1, COLUMN 4

***M'KNIGHT
REPUDIATES***

***STORY AGAINST
FRANK***

PDF PAGE 1, COLUMN 4

**M'KNIGHT SAYS
HE**

**MEMORIZED
STORY**

WRITTEN FOR HIM

R. L. Craven Denounces
Negro

as a Liar and Tells
How

McKnight's Original
Affida-
vit Was Made

Albert McKnight, colored, husband of Minola McKnight, the cook at the Selig home, where Leo M. Frank lived at the time Mary Phagan was killed, on January 18 made an affidavit to Captain C. W. Burke, employed in the defense of Frank, repudiating an affidavit damaging to Frank which he made before the trial and repudiating his testimony damaging to Frank which he gave during the trial.

McKnight, then and now employed by the Beck & Gregg Hardware company, made an affidavit to R. L. Craven, his "boss" at the hardware store, that Frank on the Saturday afternoon of the killing stayed only a few minutes in the dining room when he came home to lunch, and that his wife Minola, told him she had overheard Mrs. Frank say that Frank on that Saturday night acted like a drunk man, slept on the floor, talked like a man in trouble and distress, etc. McKnight on the witness stand testified in substance to these same things.

McKnight in his affidavit to Burke now swears that his affidavit to Craven was a lie, that his testimony at the trial was a lie, and furthermore he swears that Craven put him up to making the affidavit, and even wrote out the affidavit and persuaded him to swear to it.

Craven was seen last night at his home in Kirkwood by a Journal reporter and informed of the substance of McKnight's affidavit to Burke. Craven denounced the negro as a liar in claiming that he (Craven) suggested a single word of the affidavit, and gave to The Journal reporter a brief, but comprehensive account of the circumstances leading up to and surrounding the marking of the affidavit by McKnight which is printed below.

McKnight, in the presence of reporters, asserted Saturday night that the affidavit made public by Captain Burke is the whole truth, and he answered all questions put to him.

"Mr. Craven tried to make me think I would get part of the reward," McKnight says, "I didn't really believe that I would get any money, but I thought that Mr. Craven would be good to me if I said what he wanted me to say."

"I was laid off from work, when

(Continued on Page 3, Col. 1.)

PDF PAGE 3, COLUMN 1

**M'KNIGHT DENIES
STORY**

PDF PAGE 3, COLUMN 1

**M'KNIGHT SAYS
HE**

**MEMORIZED
STORY**

**WRITTEN
FOR HIM**

Charges R. L. Craven
Induced

Him to Testify
Falsely,

Says He Didn't See
Frank

on Day of Murder

(Continued from Page One.)

the young lady was killed, but a few days afterwards Mr. Craven sent a man to my house and told me to go to work.

TESTIMONY BY MEMORY.

"Then two or three days later we got to talking about my wife being a cook for the Seligs. Mr. Craven asked me if I knew anything about the murder or if my wife did, and I told him no. And then he wrote out what he wanted me to say and I learned it like you do a piece. Nothing happened for two or three days, and I went to Mr. Craven and told him I better not tell any lies.

“It’s too late now, he said to me, for the detectives are coming. Then I thought I had better stick to the lie and I did.”

“When I was at the trial I started to tell the truth two or three times, but every time I did I thought I had better make the lie stick if I could.”

VINDICATES OFFICIALS.

While attacking Craven, McKnight asserts that the city detectives and the other prosecuting officials had absolutely nothing to do with the frame-up, and on the contrary told him repeatedly not to say anything except the truth under pain of the chaingang.

At the trial McKnight testified that between 1 and 2 o’clock on Memorial day he was at the home of Mr. Frank to see Minola and that Frank came in about 1:30 o’clock, and did not eat any dinner, and remained only about five minutes before starting back to the city.

However, he figured importantly in the case. His statement to the detectives resulted in the detention of his wife.

Facing her with the officers, McKnight tried to get the woman to corroborate his statement, which originally contained allegations that Mrs. Frank had told the cook that Frank was drunk on the Saturday night of the crime and had admitted killing a girl and other statements, which were not admitted as evidence.

She refused to corroborate him and subsequently was placed in a cell. She was released after she had signed an affidavit some hours later in which she did substantiate her husband’s story. This affidavit she repudiated on the witness stand, saying at the trial that she was forced to sign it to secure her release.

McKnight says that he has never separated from Minola despite the fact that during the trial they were charging each other with perjury.

“HAD TO STICK TO IT.”

“She would tell me every night that I was lying,” he says, and “I told her yes, but I had to stick to it, since I had told it.”

“What caused your change of heart?” a reporter asked the negro.

“I don’t know, Minola kept worrying me because I lied, and then I just decided to tell the truth.”

EXPLAINS MIRROR STORY.

The negro answered every question put to him by newspaper men. A very plausible part of his story was that he could see people in all parts of the Selig dining room, when he would catch a glimpse of a mirror, which was hanging on the wall.

Asked how he happened to say that the negro declared that he had told Mr. Craven that he had seen people by means of the mirror and that the latter told him to say that in that way he got a look at Frank on the Saturday of the tragedy.

The negro’s repudiation of his testimony is complete and he declares that he hopes, by his present statement which he is willing to make to any court, he will undo a part of the wrong that his “lies” did Frank.

The negro does not appear to realize that he is doing anything remarkable and frequently during his talk with Captain Burke and reporters, he would laugh and smile. He is not unintelligent, however.

He says that while they were “fixing” up the story that Mr. Craven would often chuckle and exclaim “that’s good stuff.”

His account of the conversations with his wife whom he now asserts was telling the whole truth at the trial was extremely ludicrous.

NEVER OFFERED REWARD.

The negro, who is still working with the Beck & Gregg Co., declares that she has never been offered a reward of any sort, to change his story, and that the only person besides his wife, who has talked to him about the matter, is Captain Burke, who “talked a little religion” to him.

In every instance, where the point was in any way damaging to Frank McKnight now declares that his story was framed by Craven.

According to his assertion in one affidavit Minola told him that Mrs. Frank had told her that Frank was in trouble.

As a matter of fact, he says, several days after the murder, when Frank was brought to his residence by detectives who took him away at the same hour, Frank did remark to the cook, Albert says, that he was afraid that they were going to lock him up.

MR. CRAVEN’S STORY.

The statement made to The Journal last night by R. L. Craven, at his home, 11 Campbell Street, in Kirkwood, was as follows:

“I work at the Beck & Gregg Hardware company. Albert McKnight works under me. Some time after the killing of Mary Phagan—I reckon it was two or three weeks—Albert was helping unload a freight car and I heard him make some remarks to the negroes about Leo M. Frank that attracted my attention.”

“I called him in and asked him what he knew about the killing. He said he ought to know something about it, as his wife had been cooking where Mr. Frank lived for a year or two. Then I began to question him and he said he didn’t want to say much, because he was afraid he might get locked up. I told him if he knew anything about the killing, he ought to tell it. Finally, he said he would tell what he knew.”

“So I took him into the building, and got him to go into the full details and tell me all he knew. I got Mr. A. Morrison, the general manager of the store, to conceal himself where Albert wouldn’t see him but where he could hear every word that Albert said. As Albert told me his story I took it down in writing.

“He told me he was in the kitchen on the Saturday afternoon of the killing when Frank came home. He said he saw Frank in a mirror. He said Frank came into the dining room and looked at himself in the sideboard mirror, and that he stayed in the dining room only a few minutes and then went out and caught a car.”

“I then asked him if his wife, Minola McKnight, knew anything, and he said she did. He went on to tell me what Minola had told him—about her overhearing Mrs. Frank say Frank acted like he was drunk that Saturday night, and slept on the floor, and carried on like he was in trouble and distress. I asked Albert if he thought Minola would tell this herself, and he said he thought she would. He suggested that I go out to his house and have a talk with Minola.”

READ IT OVER.

“After Albert finished his story I read over to him what I had taken down, and asked him if it was correct. He said it was. I then called in a bookkeeper, who has since left the store and whose name I don’t recall, to witness the paper, he being a notary public. Albert signed what I had written down, and swore to it, and the bookkeeper then stamped it with his notary public seal. That

same day, I think it was, Detectives Starnes and Campbell came to the store and had an interview with Albert, and went over the statement with him, and he assured them it was correct in every particular.”

“Either that night or a night or so later, I’m not certain, Mr. E. H. Pickett, who works at Beck & Gregg’s and I went out to Albert McKnight’s house and had a talk with Minola. She wouldn’t say whether Albert’s statement was true or not true. She hemmed and hawed a lot and said she wasn’t going to have anything to say about the matter. Albert tried to get her to tell what she knew, but she wouldn’t do it.”

“Some days later Mr. Pickett and I went to the police station at Albert’s request. Minola was locked up and he wanted us to help get her out. While we were there Minola made an affidavit corroborating what Albert had told me. She was cautioned by Starnes and Campbell to tell nothing but the truth. In fact, Starnes told her repeatedly that he’d rather hear something in Frank’s favor than something against him, if it was the truth.

SUGGESTED NOTHING.

“I want to say that I didn’t suggest a thing to Albert. I did not dictate a thing to him. I cautioned him particularly not to tell anything except the truth. I told him it was a serious thing to accuse a man of a crime. I told him to be sure what he was talking about, and to tell nothing but the absolute facts. In addition, Starnes and Campbell cautioned him the same way. I had no interest whatever in the killing of Mary Phagan except to want to see all the facts brought out. I had no idea of connecting Albert McKnight with the case until I heard his remarks while unloading the freight car. Then, as a citizen I felt it my duty to learn from him and to put this information in the hands of the authorities.

“I can’t imagine why Albert told Burke that I put him up to telling what he did and that I dictated his affidavit. If he makes any such statement, he is simply lying, that’s all.”

PDF PAGE 1, COLUMN 5

Here Is Negro McKnight’s Sworn Repudiation of Testimony Against Frank

Albert McKnight, twenty-one years of age, residing at rear of 17 Georgia avenue, in Atlanta, Fulton County, Ga., deposes and says that he is at the present time at the store of Beck & Gregg and deponent says that he was at work there most of the month of April, 1913.

Deponent says that he was a witness of the state in the case of Georgia vs. Leo M. Frank and testified to a story that had been prepared for him R. L. Craven, a white man employed by Beck & Gregg.

Deponent says that the story prepared by R. L Craven is not the truth and that the evidence that the deponent gave at the above-named trial was not the truth.

Deponent now says that it is true that his wife, Minola, was employed at the home of Mr. Selig, where Mr. Frank resided, and it is true that on Saturday, April 26, he called at the Selig home to see his wife, but deponent says he reached the Selig home a little before 12 o’clock, noon, and that he heard the 12 o’clock whistle blow at the Southern railway shops, and also

heard the 12:30 o'clock whistle blow while he was talking with his wife, and deponent says that when he heard the 12:30 whistle blow he left the Selig home and walked up Georgia avenue to Pulliam street, to Bass street, and to his own home which at that time was located in the rear of 351 Pulliam street.

Deponent says that he did not see Mr. Frank at all on April 26 and that his evidence at the trial of Mr. Frank was the result of a plan perfected by R. L. Craven and others to collect the reward offered for the arrest and conviction of the murderer of Mary Phagan.

Deponent says that he did not see Mr. Frank at all on April 26 and that his evidence at the trial of Mr. Frank was the result of a plan perfected by R. L. Craven and others to collect the reward offered for the arrest and conviction of the murderer of Mary Phagan.

Deponent says that he told Mr. R. L. Craven that he did not want to tell any lies on Mr. Frank, but Mr. Craven would tell him to go right ahead and do what he told him to do, and that he would get the reward already referred to above, and he was weak enough to do as Mr. Craven told him to do.

Deponent says that he is sorry for all the wrong he has done to Mr. Frank, and that he wants this true statement of facts placed in the hands of Mr. L. Z. Rosser to be used by him with the hope that the same can in some way undo the great wrong he was led to do by the white people he was working with at the store of Beck & Gregg.

Deponent again says that he did not see Leo M. Frank at any time or place on Saturday, April 26, 1913, and that he will so testify when called upon at any time.

ALBERT M'KNIGHT.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th
day of January, 1914. C.
W. BURKE, Notary, Fulton County.

Sworn to and subscribed to with signature
acknowledged before me, January 19, 1914.

E. D. THOMAS,

Chief Judge of the Municipal Court of Atlanta

PDF PAGE 1, COLUMN

7

**ROSSER AND
ARNOLD**

**POINTEDLY
COMMENT**

**ON HAIR
EVIDENCE**

They Intimate That
State's

Whole Case, Like
Finding of

Hair, Will Dissolve As
a

Myth

“WILL MYTHS
DISSOLVE

BEFORE FRANK IS
DEAD?”

That is the Question, They

Assert, Which is Horrible to

Contemplate—Here is Their

Statement in Full

A second and more extended statement, commenting upon the admission of Dr. H. F. Harris that he had reported to Solicitor Dorsey prior to the Frank trial that the hair found on the lathe handle on the second floor of the pencil factory was not the same as that clipped by him from the head of Mary Phagan, was issued Saturday afternoon by Attorneys Rosser and Arnold for the defense.

In this second statement Leo M. Frank's lawyers attack both Dr. Harris and Solicitor Dorsey. They declare that Dr. Harris' microscopic test of the hair was an infallible test and should have settled the matter and assert that it is nonsense for him to claim that he did not consider the hair feature a material point in the case.

It was the alleged discovery of the hair and the alleged finding of bloodspots on the metal room flow, contend Messrs. Rosser and Arnold, upon which the state sought to establish its contention that Mary Phagan was murdered on the second floor of the pencil factory, and that it was necessary for the state to locate the crime on the second floor in order to connect Frank with it.

DRY QUESTIONS WERE ASKED

Questions asked Dr. Harris by Attorney Arnold when he was upon the witness stand are cited in the statement and it is held that these questions were so wide in their scope that had Dr. Harris been perfectly frank he would have told all about having made the hair tests. "The doctor cannot say he was not asked," goes on the statement. "'To contend otherwise would be shallowest quibbling, not to be resorted to in a case involving life and death.'"

Solicitor Dorsey is charged with having stressed the hair incident in his argument before the jury in the trial court and in his brief before the supreme court, and it is asserted there can be no doubt that the hair incident had its weight on the court, jury and public.

The statement concludes with this paragraph:

"Since it thus develops that the hair, as physical evidence and showing Frank committed the crime, was a myth, and hard no existence in fact, the inquiry arises: How much of the state's case is a myth? Is not the charge of perversion, based upon the evidence of Jim Conley, also a myth? Are not the various slanders circulated against Frank by slanders circulated against Frank by malicious minds equally as much without foundation as the state's claim of finding the hair of Mary Phagan on this lathe? The

question, horrible to contemplate, is: Will these myths be dissolved while rank lives or after he is dead?"

Statement in Full.

The statement of Attorneys Rosser and Arnold Follows in full:

Editor Journal.—The two evening papers carried a short interview from us on Friday, but the admissions of Dr. Harris ought not to be passed over so hurriedly—the matter is too vital, not only to this case but the integrity of courts of justice.

Very early in this case the state adopted the theory that the murder took place on the second floor of the factory. Indeed, such a theory was essential to Frank's guilt.

Every effort of the state, therefore, was bent to establish this

(Continued on Page 4, Col. 1.)

PDF PAGE 4, COLUMN 1

ATTORNEYS RAP

EVIDENCE

**FRANK'S
LAWYERS**

**SCORE
DORSEY AND
HIS CHIEF
EXPERT**

In Caustic Statement
Issued

Saturday Night
Rosser and

Arnold Further Discuss Dr. Harris' Admission

(Continued from Page One.)

theory. A man by the name of Barret claimed to find on that floor what he contended to be blood spots and a few strands of hair, which were asserted to be Mary Phagan's hair hanging to a lathe.

These two finds were heralded everywhere by Frank's accusers as evidence conclusive of his guilt, and the state put forward all its force and power to show that the blood and hair was the hair and blood of Mary Phagan.

The solicitor, like every other well informed, intelligent man, knew that it would be scientifically demonstrated whether the apparent blood was human blood and whether the hair was Mary Phagan's hair.

Dr. Claude Smith, an expert chemist examined the red substance smeared upon the floor and supposed to be human blood. The smeared wood was chipped up, making four or five chips smeared equally with the substance appearing to the eye to be black.

Blood On Only One Chip.

Dr. Smith reported that he found on only one of the chips, there being no blood on the others. Dr. Smiths' evidence was not guesswork, but was as certain as mathematics. It demonstrated

that the substance appearing from the eye to be blood was not blood; for, had it been blood, the doctor would have found it on all the chips, for the smear was equally on all the chips.

On the one chip he found only a trace of blood, only a trace of blood, only four or five corpuscles to the field, whereas a drop of blood contains about 80,000 corpuscles.

While the doctor could demonstrate whether the smear was blood or not, he could not tell whether it was human or animal blood, nor whether it had been on the floor for days, weeks or years.

It is, therefore, perfectly clear that the claim that the blood of Mary Phagan was found on the second floor was not sustained. The evidence of non-expert witnesses that the smear seemed to be blood was clearly of no avail as against this accurate and unmistakable expert testimony. An honest, capable expert can tell the existence, or non-existence, of blood just the same as a mathematician can tell that two and two are four.

As to the Hair.

To determine, among other things, whether the hair was the hair of Mary Phagan, the state (At the expense of the county, as we are informed) employed Dr. Harris, an eminent expert. Dr. Harris exhumed the body of Mary Phagan and obtained some of her hair. With the aid of a powerful microscope (as fine as there is in the world, he says) he compared the hair found in the factory with the hair of Mary Phagan.

That examination demonstrated that the hair found was not the hair of Mary Phagan. It differed Dr. Harris reported that the hair was not Mary's—that it differed from Mary's in shade, texture and shape.

An honest, efficient expert cannot be mistaken in determining whether two samples of hair did or did not come from the same person.

Under a powerful microscope the difference between the hair of different persons is almost as easily discerning as the difference between two trees or two human faces. Indeed, as to this, the microscopic test is practically infallible. Dr. Harris knew that, and he knew it was not Mary Phagan's hair. An intelligent man like Mr. Dorsey knew, without being told that the microscope would, and did, settle the matter. To that end he employed Dr. Harris. Dr. Harris settled the matter, and Mr. Dorsey knew he had settled it.

Non-Expert's Opinion

It is equally certain that the opinions of non-expert witnesses is of little or no value in determining whether two samples of hair came from the same or different persons. In a contest with the microscope, such opinions are absolutely worthless. No two men knew this any better than Dr. Harris and the solicitor. Both of them know that Dr. Harris' examination settled the matter; for, when Harris told the solicitor that the hair was not Mary Phagan's—that it differed from her hair in shade, shape and texture, the solicitor told the doctor, as stated in the evening Journal, "there would be no necessity of going further into the hair theory"... "that he would let the matter end there."

With this certain knowledge in the face of Dr. Harris and the solicitor, the Frank trial was begun, Mr. Dorsey, being the solicitor, representing the state, and Dr. Harris secretary of the state board of health, the leading expert witness.

Claim Facts Were Concealed.

During the trial, and for months thereafter, Dr. Harris concealed the fact that he knew that the hair found in the factory

was not Mary Phagan's hair, although he must have known that the solicitor was contending, with all his force from the beginning to the end of the case, that the hair found was the hair of Mary Phagan and was strong physical evidence of Frank's guilt.

It is, therefore, nonsense to say that he did not consider the matter a material one. Why was he experimenting as to the hair? Surely not to kill time. He must have known the state's contention. He must have known if the hair was Mary Phagan's that fact would hurt Frank; and, if not, it would aid him. The papers were full of this. Scarcely was there an intelligent man or woman in the city who did not appreciate its materiality. Is it possible that this learned, expert witness stood alone in his ignorance as to the importance of the experiments he was making? Such a thing is, of course, possible; but, if so, a possibility close to the miraculous.

Says Harris Was Asked.

The doctor cannot say he was not asked. When on the witness stand, Mr. Arnold, for the defense, asked him the following questions:

Q. "What did he (the solicitor) tell you to examine (referring to the examination of Mary Phagan's body)? What part of the body did he tell you to examine?"

Q. "What did you have in your own mind? What were you working to determine by the autopsy? What did you understand you were seeking?"

Can there be any doubt but that these questions covered Dr. Harris' examination of the hair? To contend otherwise is the shallowest quibbling not to be resorted to in a case involving life and death.

Dr. Harris answered these questions without once mentioning the subject of hair. As to other parts of the body examined, he went into the minutest details.

Attacks Solicitor.

Contentends, however, as we cannot, that Harris was ignorant of the importance of this hair. What about the solicitor? He knew its importance, and he knew that the hair found in the factory was not Mary Phagan's hair! He knew, as Dr. Harris knew, that this hair was put under one of the best microscopes, and that it had been demonstrated beyond a doubt that it was not Mary Phagan's hair.

And yet, with that knowledge, he showed by Barrett that he found hair, and that by Magnolia Kennedy that it looked like Mary's hair.

It is worse than silly to say that these "look-like" witnesses saw more of the hair than did Dr. Harris. He had enough, and more than enough, for microscopic purposes. He retained the microscopic sections and returned the balance to the solicitor.

Not only so, but with his knowledge, the solicitor urged in his speech to the jury three or four different times that this hair was Mary Phagan's hair. He knew the truth, and, in spite of his knowledge, urged upon the jury that this hair was evidence of Frank's guilt.

Solicitor Argued Hair.

Not only so, but he made the same contention in his brief in the supreme court.

Harris told him the truth! He recognized it by telling Harris "that he would let the matter end"; and yet, in the highest court of the land, with human life at stake, he positively and

emphatically states that the finding of this hair in the factory is one evidence of Frank's guilt.

In this the solicitor, in his zeal, misconceived his duty. The state of Georgia sternly demands full punishment for the guilty, but always in open candor—never by concealment or subterfuge.

The solicitor says that the hair is now lost. Dr. Harris says that he returned the hair to the solicitor, except the microscopic sections which he examined. Of course, we cannot undertake to say why, or how, this hair was lost by the solicitor. It was never produced at the trial; but that it had its weight on the court, jury and public, there can be no doubt!

“How Much Is a Myth?”

Since it thus developed that the hair, as a physical evidence showing Frank to have committed the crime, was a myth and had no existence in fact, the inquiry arises; How much else of the state's case is a myth? Is not the charge of perversion, based upon the evidence of Jim Conley, also a myth? Are not the various slanders circulated against Frank, by malicious minds, equally as much without foundation as the state's claim of finding the hair of Mary Phagan on this lathe?

The question, horrible to contemplate, is: Will these myths be dissolved while Frank lives or after he is dead?

REUBEN R. ARNOLD.

L. Z. ROSSER.

In the demand filled Saturday with the city government of Atlanta by R. P. Barrett, formerly employed in the National Pencil factory for \$1,000 reward offered by the city for evidence to convict the slayer of Mary Phagan in that factory last April, Barrett recited that the evidence on which Leo M. Frank was convicted of

that crime was discovered by himself. It was he who found strands of hair on one of the lathes and what were supposed to be blood stains on the floor in the metal room on Monday, following the finding of the body on Sunday. He asserts that this evidence led to the immediate arrest and subsequent conviction of Frank.

Dr. H. F. Harris, secretary of the state board of health, was the expert witness whose testimony for the state tended to establish that Mary Phagan was killed within a certain brief time after she had eaten her last meal of cabbage. Dr. Harris' sensational admission Friday was that in his opinion, formed after a microscopical examination, the strands of hair found by Barrett were not from the head of Mary Phagan.

Case Is Complicated.

Thus is the case complicated further. Barrett's claim for the reward will be considered by city council at its next meeting.

Although attorneys for Frank still are engaged busily in the preparation of their motion for a rehearing of the case by the supreme court, there is no doubt that in the event, this motion is not granted an extraordinary motion for a new trial will be field in the superior court. This motion will be based on Dr. Harris' sensational admission, published exclusively in The Journal, that it was his opinion at the time of the trial that the hair found on the lathe was not Mary Phagan's.

Conley's Trial Monday.

Jim Conley, the negro sweeper at the factory, who accused Frank of the murder, will be tried before Judge Ben H. Hill, criminal division of the superior court, Monday. It is probable the trial will be brief and will conclude in one day. His attorney, William M. Smith, will admit the records of the Frank trial, embracing Conley's own statement that he assisted Frank in disposing of the body, but will plead Conley is not guilty under

either of the two indictments against him. One of the indictments charges a misdemeanor, involving a maximum sentence of one year. The other charges a felony, with a maximum sentence of three years. Both allege that Conley is an accessory after the fact.

There is a question whether the offense in this instance would be a felony or a misdemeanor. Solicitor Dorsey will ask Judge Hill to decide that. It is probable no jury will sit at the trial, the questions being technical legal points, Conley and his lawyer admitting the records.